

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 30, 1956

FIVE CENTS

**UAW's Education Conference:
'VANGUARD' WITH A WHISPER**

... page 6

The Bevanite Theory of Stalinism

... page 7

Big Student Strike in Mexico

... page 5

Fifty Years of the IWW

... page 4

Kutcher Wins, Jim Crow Hit, In the Courts

Two court decisions this week were big advances for democracy. In one, James Kutcher, the "legless veteran," won another victory for his case, in the federal Court of Appeals. In the second, a Supreme Court delivered a blow against bus segregation of Negroes which may possibly be fatal to this sector of Jim Crow. In both cases, however, here was considerable question as to how conclusive these decisions are.

In October 1952 the Supreme Court decided that Kutcher had been improperly fired by the Veterans Administration from his \$42-a-week clerk's job, solely for membership in an organization (Socialist Workers Party) listed as "subversive" by the attorney general. The VA thereupon revised its charges, and the case started all over again winding its way up to the high bench.

In the new decision the Court of Appeals apparently based its reversal of the lower court on the ground of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, which required that firing of veterans must be preceded by 30-days' notice in writing of specific charges. The court found that this had not been done; in particular, that the charges on which he had been fired were different from the charges later made by the VA Loyalty Board.

To this extent the ruling was a technical one, rather than one based on throwing out the charges themselves, although critical remarks were made on these points too.

There is still a possibility that the government may appeal to the Supreme Court, or that the VA may bring new proceedings to oust Kutcher from his job, thus providing a new basis for the already heinous persecution of the legless veteran.

If Kutcher gets his job back by court action, it means over \$20,000 in back pay for him.

In the bus case, the Supreme Court took a cryptic sort of action, the exact significance of which lawyers are still discussing. It let stand a Court of Appeals ruling which struck down a South Carolina law requiring segregation of passengers in motor vehicles. The important thing is that this law dealt with intra-state busses. Jim Crow in inter-state travel has already been outlawed by the court.

The court decision, however, said simply that the appeal is dismissed, and referred to a precedent not involving segregation.

But cryptic or not, the decision has already had an impact on Jim Crow. Bus companies in 13 Southern cities have announced the end of segregation; this includes the bus company involved in the famous Montgomery boycott.

Editors Vote: 'We're Losing The Cold War Against Russia'

By GORDON HASKELL

The feeling that the foreign policy of the American government has got this country firmly wedged into an alley which is blind at both ends appears to be spreading into some of the remoter intellectual areas of the country. This became evident when 81 editors, gathered at a breakfast in connection with the recent convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, voted two to one that the United States is "losing the cold war." Guests at the breakfast (including justices of the Supreme Court, cabinet members and the like) also voted 43-26 for the same proposition.

Just to illustrate the kind of thing these editors and other dignitaries must have had in mind: The same issue of the *New York Times* which reported the above poll (April 22), also reported the following items:

MAY DAY ISSUE

comes next week, including May Day greetings from our friends. Week after that (May 14) comes our annual special pamphlet-issue. This one will be devoted to the subject of "LABOR IN AMERICAN POLITICS."

Item 1: "During the seven-year history of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization the fourteen nations composing it have spent almost \$312 billions for military uses, according to a report by the North Atlantic Council."

Of this sum, the United States has spent approximately \$252 billions, or an average of \$36 billions per year.

Item 2: "Privately West German politicians and officials say the Soviet government is winning hands down in all sectors of the 'cold war' and that if leadership is not reasserted in the West the battle in Europe is doomed. Publicly these Germans affirm that all is well." [The Germans referred to are, of course, prominent members and supporters of the Adenauer government.]

In the United States, the awareness that

WHY?

the failure of the government's foreign policy is no longer confined to experts in the field but is becoming widely recognized in the country has led to what the papers call the "injection" of the issue into the presidential campaign. Both President Eisenhower and presidential aspirant Stevenson addressed major foreign policy speeches to the newspaper editors' convention.

On the same day, George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs, addressed the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, and George Kennan, former head of the policy-planning staff of the State Department, spoke on a TV program on "The Revolution in American Policy."

It would seem that these men would be fitting representatives in any "great debate" on foreign policy between the

(Turn to last page)

STALINIST ANTI-SEMITISM: The Question Is Not Yet Over

By AL FINDLEY

The Polish Stalinist press—reprinted in the U.S. Stalinist organ *Freiheit*—has now confessed to the anti-Semitic persecutions by the Stalin regime, but this confession does not end the matter.

(For one thing, now Khrushchev in London is reported to have called any talk of anti-Semitism in Russia "nonsense," speaking to the national committee of the British Labor Party.—ED.)

The anti-Semitic policy of the Stalinist regime included discriminatory practices in the armed services, in some institutions of learning, and especially in the diplomatic service and foreign-trade organizations. The general Russian policy of allowing and even encouraging all nationalities of the country to use and develop their native language and culture (provided the correct party line was followed in all matters) was not extended to the Jews.

Almost every trace of Yiddish culture—which only a few years before had flourished—was destroyed almost overnight in the mid-forties. All Yiddish writers, some of them extreme Stalinist sycophants—disappeared from view. The reports were that some had been killed and others imprisoned.

The height of this anti-Semitic campaign came, of course, with the accusation and arrest of the Jewish doctors in a framed-up "plot" allegedly gotten up by the Joint Distribution Committee (Jewish relief organization) to subvert the Russian government.

While this period is now well known, it is less well-known that anti-Semitism did not cease after the death of Stalin, in spite of a certain easing-up.

After the old tyrant disappeared, there were signs of leniency toward Russia's ethnic and religious groups; but this easing was not extended equally to the Jews. There have been a few concessions: the release and rehabilitation of the Kremlin doctors; the relaxation of the complete ban on Jewish emigration (about 20 were permitted to leave); and the cessation of open anti-Semitic attacks in the press.

(Continued on page 3)

United Socialist May Day in Chicago

Chicago will see an all-in united socialist and labor May Day rally on May 1.

The Independent Socialist League and Young Socialist League of Chicago are among the 12 sponsors, the others being: the Socialist Party of Illinois, the Federation of Jewish Trade Unions, Jewish Labor Committee, IWW, Social Democratic Federation, Workmen's Circle, the Forward, U. of C. Socialist Club, Verband, and Jewish Labor Bund.

These groups constitute the Chicago Joint May Day Celebration Committee which will hold its rally at the Midland Hotel, 172 West Adams, at 8 p.m.

The speakers will be: Frank Marquart, education director of UAW Local 212; Sid Lens, socialist author and writer; Hershel Himmelfarb of the Bund; and Jacob Siegal of the Forward.

On the Saturday preceding May Day (April 28 at 8 p.m.) there will be a social held by the ISL, SP and IWW jointly, to which all are invited. It will take place at Lloyd Singer's, 6139 S. Greenwood (1100 east), and the announcement predicts "beer, singing, and a general good time."

It's going to be on FRIDAY, May 4, in New York
Celebrate May Day with the ISL & YSL

Talk by Shachtman . . . Dancing, Social, Refreshments . . .
Special skit on 20th Congress

AT ADELPHI HALL, 74 FIFTH AVENUE, near 13th Street

Phila. Third Camp Conference Re-examines Radical Politics

Phila., Apr. 16

The Philadelphia Third Camp Conference held yesterday in the Jane Addams House was a well attended and stimulating event. Approximately 100 people attended all or some of the three discussion periods and participated in critical and constructive examination of three important topics of the times.

A. J. Muste led off with an evaluation of "The Political Assassination of Stalin" in which the Communist Party leadership is now engaged. Muste reminded the audience that the present Russian leaders were not even silent critics of Stalin but his most loyal supporters. He believes that their recent actions were motivated least of all by a change of heart. Motivations suggested by Muste were:

(1) Russia needs to compete with United States for international friends. (2) For the first time in many decades the country finds itself no longer on the verge of starvation. (3) The Communist Party is trying to woo Socialist Parties into united front activity. (4) Because of the relative strength of the Chinese CP and the independent prestige of its leaders, the Russian CP cannot again be headed by the infallible international dictator of all Communist Parties.

Muste challenged the claims of the present party line that Russia only became bureaucratic under Stalin in the 1930s. He showed that such measures were taken by Stalin in the 1920s against Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders.

He also argued that they stemmed from a number of concepts which he claimed were held by the Communist Party in Lenin's day. These were: the concept of a small revolutionary vanguard party, one-party system, the concept of democratic socialism, and a fixation on the concept of power. Muste admitted that the backward nature of Russian economy and society and the failure of the socialist revolutions in more advanced countries were also important factors.

SEE LOOSENING UP

Michael Harrington, national chairman of the Young Socialist League, reversed Muste's emphasis on the reasons for the failure of the socialist revolution in Russia. He pointed out that it was incorrect to see any similarity between the struggle for leadership in the Russian CP at the death of Lenin and the situation at the death of Stalin. Stalin had to destroy the socialist revolution to overcome his opposition and to create a new totalitarian collectivist society.

The maneuvering of his heirs and the destruction of the Stalin myth were seen by Harrington to be essentially the actions of the bureaucrats to stabilize themselves and to enjoy the fruits of their privileged positions.

Muste postulates that the present collective leadership will continue in the foreseeable future. Bayard Rustin, the third speaker at the conference, questioned that it would be possible to have this loosening of power at the top in the CP without some of the desire for loosening seeping down to the exploited masses in Russia.

This aspect was among those vigorously debated in the discussion period. Out of the discussion there appeared to emerge agreement on the following concepts: The present regimes of the CP are not now either democratic or socialist; the loosening of controls have been planned from the top and are more apparent than real; nevertheless they are the results not only of bureaucratic interests domestic and foreign but also of the pressure of the working people in Russia. It is correct to be skeptical, but also Third Camp advocates should carefully watch for signs of demands from the ranks particularly in Communist Parties outside Russia for increased democracy and show willingness to offer aid and encouragement.

RE-EVALUATION

In late afternoon the conference dealt with the next topic of "The New Radicalism," with Michael Harrington as the principle speaker. Harrington opened with an outline of the differences between the old liberalism in the days of capitalism on its way up and the New Deal liberalism of capitalism on the way down.

The later-day liberalism never solved its problems but was rescued by the war and the Permanent War Economy. Liberal-

ism has no alternative to the war economy, in fact there is no solution to it within liberal bounds. That solution must be offered by the new radicalism. It is the unhappy fact that to this moment such a radicalism has not yet succeeded in capturing the imaginations of the vast majority of the working class in the United States.

Harrington spoke in opposition to those who wish to cast aside all known radicalism, its ideas, its traditions, and the small organizations which exist. He proposed instead that certain very basic tenets be re-examined.

Some of these would be: (a) Nationalization is the equivalent of socialism; (b) Attitude toward violence and destruction; (c) Democratic forms are but pretense and farce; (d) Economic changes are determining over social and political change.

Briefly the findings of the re-evaluation, he thought, would be somewhat along these lines. The question of who controls the nationalized industries and for whose benefit they are operated is a key one. The workers must have some concrete evidence that they now own their factory. The atomic weapons now greatly increase the danger that destruction of human life and productive facilities could be so great that the material basis of plenty could not be available for socialism. The customary democratic forms are important but they must be greatly extended not only in the political field but also in the economic sphere. They can be used to further the peoples' interest rather than to subvert it. The new radicalism must aim to bring about a social revolution and a political one as well as a radical economic change. History has shown us that economic forms can provide for collective ownership but social degradation and political subjugation can continue.

REPORT ON MONTGOMERY

The closing session was held in the evening with Bayard Rustin speaking on "The Meaning of Montgomery." The executive secretary of the War Resisters League had recently spent several weeks on the scene of the bus boycott and had just finished talks with Martin Luther King, the boycott leader.

Rustin sees the events in Montgomery as being unusually significant. They are taking place as the industrial revolution has really moved into the south. Both white and colored workers are leaving the farms, are meeting on new and unfamiliar grounds in the cities and in the factories.

Secondly, the attitude of the Southern whites has become more and more out of tune with reality. They now confess they cannot understand "their Negroes"—the last thing they would like to confess. There is a change in the Negroes' attitude—they will take "no more white folks stuff."

Continuing, Rustin claimed that the main purpose of the White Citizens Councils was to break the rising labor movement in the South. Labor must recognize and meet this challenge. The final significant fact is the utter collapse of the white liberals in the south. Even in the most critical situations they can barely whisper "no attitude."

The story of Montgomery is too familiar to repeat here but the audience found Rustin's recounting of it informative and refreshing. The speaker felt that in "Montgomery" the American Negroes have found themselves and will in the future play a more responsible role in society. America's problems will be accepted as their problems. Rustin advocated that Third Camp supporters become active in these struggles for racial equality. In a certain sense it is our colonial struggle—the United States imported its colonial problem centuries ago. The speaker foresaw a Democratic Party split off in the South which would "free" the Northern liberals.

At each session the chairman invited those attending to become active in Third Camp activities. Short statements were made of the ideas of the Third Camp and newcomers were directed to literature prepared by the local Contact Committee and to that published by participating organizations and independent general Third Camp publications. Organizations mentioned as participating in addition to the YSL and WRL were: the Independent Socialist League, the Peacemakers, and the Philadelphia local of the Socialist Party.

ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

Hillsboro School Capitulates . . . Desegregation Makes Advances

By BETTY PERKINS

The Hillsboro (Ohio) School Board has finally capitulated and after two years of litigation has admitted eighteen Negro children to the nearby white Webster School.

This most famous of Northern Jim Crow school situations has left behind it a bitter legacy, due to the last-ditch stand of the board and the grudging manner in which it finally admitted the students.

Segregation was quietly established at Hillsboro in 1939, when the schools became crowded and all Negro students were packed into ramshackle Lincoln School. Negro parents did not, however, protest until after the Supreme Court decision of 1954.

In answer to their protests the board, which was elected by a population of predominantly Southern extraction and outlook, simply redistricted the whole town, assigning two widely separated Negro neighborhoods to Lincoln.

For two years, every day, 26 children presented themselves to the 850-pupil Webster School, where they were told they had not been assigned because there was not enough room. Each day they returned to their homes where their parents and volunteer teachers, often Quakers, taught classes.

The parents' request for an injunction to prevent this segregation was refused by Cincinnati Judge John Druffel. Early this year the Circuit Court reversed Druffel's decision. Druffel then persuaded the board to appeal to the Supreme Court, which refused to review the case.

Even then the school board refused to admit the children, claiming first that it had not been legally informed of the decision; secondly, that it had not received the necessary order from Druffel; and thirdly, that the state would have to give placement tests.

After all these formalities had been fulfilled, 18 children found themselves in the same grade that they had been in two years ago. Perhaps another legal action will be necessary for the pupils to find themselves in the proper grades.

WASHINGTON CONFERENCE

A. Philip Randolph, vice-president of the AFL-CIO and head of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, has asked more than twenty leaders of Negro organizations, with 12,000,000 members, to meet with him in Washington April 24 in a "State of the Race" Conference.

The purpose of this conference is to plan a unified program supporting school desegregation, and was triggered by the recent congressional manifesto signed by Southern congressmen in Washington.

Randolph is the man who made the call for a "March on Washington" during World War II, the threat of which was enough to get a federal FEPC law from President Roosevelt.

PEASE AND QUIET

Chicago's famous Trumbull Park housing area, where anti-Negro demonstrations by large mobs were reported on the front pages of the nation's newspapers, now enjoys an atmosphere of primarily peaceful, neighborly relations among its residents.

Incidents of violence are rare, only one being reported since last summer. Police details, once numbered at 1200, are still in the area but number only 112 men. Police say that the mobs were made up

mostly of teen-agers who lived outside the project, and who were discouraged by the use of persistent, intelligent use of the police to prevent violence—a lesson to be learned and followed by those responsible for keeping peace in the South today.

"CONSPIRACY"

Charges that under the GI loan program, Negro veterans have not been able to obtain much housing and practically no on-the-job training, that no Negro veteran has benefited from farm and business loan provisions, and that veterans hospitals in the South try to send Negro patients to all-Negro hospitals were made by Mickey Levine, chairman of the American Veterans Committee, after a two-weeks tour through Tennessee, Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi.

The charges were made by Levine in a letter to the chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, asking for an investigation into what he called a definite conspiracy. The charges were denied, of course, by J. S. Patterson, acting veterans administrator.

RACIST MOB AT WORK

Detroit, scene of the huge race riots of 1943 and a city whose race relations make a police commando squad necessary, recently made headlines again when a mob of 500 angry people in a middle-class suburb demonstrated against new neighbors who were said to be colored.

John Rouse, 70, said that he was half Canadian and half Indian, and that his wife was Scotch-Irish. Despite encouragement from the city's Commission on Community Relations to resist the pressure, Rouse, because of his grandchildren and perhaps because he wanted quiet in his retirement, agreed to sell his home to a neighborhood "Improvement Association" at a profit of \$2,000.

Not content with this victory, a delegation of these racists followed the old owners of Rouse's house to their new neighborhood, where they warned their new neighbors that these people needed watching because they were "just the type" to sell their home to Negroes!

Anti-Trujillo Pickets March for Galindez

New York, Apr. 24

The disappearance of Jesus de Galindez, anti-Trujillo professor at Columbia, a refugee from Franco Spain, was brought to the attention of New York by a demonstration held at the Dominican Republic consulate, 5-6 p.m. today. The demonstration was sponsored by the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims, of which Norman Thomas is the chairman.

Approximately 30 people picketed at Rockefeller Center, where the Dominican committee is located, with signs calling for an end to the dictatorship of General Rafael Trujillo.

Trujillo's dictatorship is the subject of a reportedly sensational book, still in manuscript, by Dr. Galindez. The book which will be published soon is generally assumed to be the reason for Galindez's mysterious disappearance and probable murder. It is commonly thought that Galindez was "gotten" by agents of the Caribbean dictator.

The operation of a well-organized ring of such agents is widely suspected, its purpose being to coerce political refugees from the Dominican Republic into silence. The fact that two other well-known political opponents of the Trujillo dictatorship have been murdered in the United States helps to convince one of this situation.

Thus far, the entire case has had inadequate attention from the police authorities. The district attorney of New York seems to have done little except to confiscate copies of the manuscript of Galindez's book.

The FBI has ostentatiously kept out of the case. The Justice Department, it seems, is not going to risk offending one of their friends in the Caribbean—even if a particular friend happens to be a murderous dictator.

In Philadelphia—Hear
Max Shachtman

ON

STALINISM WITHOUT
STALIN

The Meaning of the
20th Congress

THURS., MAY 3, at 8:30 p.m.

St. James Hotel, Room 304
13th and Walnut

Admission:

Independent Socialist League

LONDON LETTER In the British Labor Party Another Party Battle Looming

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Apr. 12

There is still some time to go before this year's annual conference of the Labor Party—six months in fact—but already maneuvering for position has begun for the key post of party treasurer, which carries with it a seat on the National Executive Committee.

At last year's conference and the one before, the battle of the treasurer was fought out in a straight contest between the left and right, with Hugh Gaitskell representing the right and Aneurin Bevan the left. Now Gaitskell is the leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party and as such gets an automatic seat on the NEC, so there is no longer any need for him to stand as treasurer to collect the all-important votes of the right-wing trade unions in order to compensate for his lack of support among the local Labor Party branches.

With the question of the treasurer once again up in the air the right-wing elements of the party are now busy gathering support for a new man to oppose Bevan. Their first choice seems to be George Brown, Member of Parliament for Belper, extreme rightwinger and active anti-Bevanite.

Brown was nominated last week by his local Labor Party for the treasurer's job—but this by no means indicates that he will gather any material support from other local parties. His real strength lies in the fact that he is chairman of the

trade-union group of Labor MPs and his parliamentary position is supported by the Transport and General Workers' Union—the largest trade union in Britain and one with a long tradition of backing the right wing of the Labor Party.

It seems certain, therefore, that Brown will be backed as treasurer by the T & GWU and its satellites on the right wing of the trade-union movement.

A few days ago a further complication arose when the Amalgamated Engineering Union decided to nominate Charles Pannell, MP for West Leeds, as treasurer. This move caused some surprise because Pannell is as right-wing as Brown and, furthermore, is secretary of the trade-union group of Labor MPs and hence works closely with Brown.

RIGHT WING SPLIT?

The leadership of the AEU has in the past supported Gaitskell, and incurred the wrath of its rank and file in the process. Last year the rank and file placed the issue before the union's court of appeal, alleging that the leadership had been instructed by the membership to support Bevan and in supporting Gaitskell had shown complete disregard for the wishes of the membership.

After due deliberation the AEU court of appeal found in favor of the members, and said that the votes of the union should have been thrown behind Bevan. The leadership of the AEU, it would ap-

pear, has decided that it dare not risk the consequences of voting against Bevan again and so has decided to complicate the issue by nominating Pannell—a member of the AEU—and claiming that union loyalty demands that he be supported in the ballot.

Bevan must be viewing this process with some pleasure—because it is fairly clear that the right-wing vote will be split to the benefit of the left. It is impossible to assess, at this stage, Bevan's chances in the fight, but they look a little rosier than last year. For one thing it is very likely that the Miners Union, which carries a very large fistful of votes, will support Bevan this year for the first time.

BACKROOM APPROACH

But the unpleasant feature of the current proceedings is that it is all on the basis of organizational maneuvers, committee-room deals and back-stage bargaining. Everybody on the left would feel much happier if Bevan's fight for treasurership was conducted on the basis of policy. This is Bevan's only justification for standing as treasurer: in order to wage a political fight for an elected position in which trade-union and local party votes count together. Otherwise he could stand for a seat on the NEC in the section reserved for representatives of local parties where he would be certain to top the poll.

While the party limbers up for a new

round in the battle of the leaders, one of the old leaders has added yet another jewel to his crown.

Earl Attlee, at one time affectionately known as "Clem," who was elevated—or relegated, depending on which way you look at it—to the House of Lords when he resigned as leader of the Labor Party last December, has recently been made a Knight Companion of the Most Noble Order of the Garter. This is the senior British order of knighthood, very exclusive, and is bestowed as a personal gift by the Queen who is sovereign of the order.

HONI SOIT

Earl Attlee joins other Knights of the Garter such as the Dukes of Edinburgh, Gloucester and Windsor; the Kings of Sweden, Denmark and Norway; the Emperor of Ethiopia; Prince Paul of Yugoslavia; Lord Montgomery of Alamein; Sir Winston Churchill, and others of equally proletarian stock. Along with them he will be able to wear a garter on his leg and hang his standard in St. George's Chapel at Windsor.

A small consolation with which he doubtless eases his conscience is the fact that the garter is worn on the left leg, just below the knee.

The order was founded by King Edward III in the 14th century. Unconfirmed rumors have it that it was set up when Edward retrieved a garter dropped by a female. Observing the knowing looks of his attendant knights he said: "Honi soit qui mal y pense," which roughly means: "Evil be he who evil thinks," and thereupon set up an order called the Knights of the Garter with that tag as its motto. Perhaps Earl Attlee uses the motto as a reply to his old comrades who question his motives.

Stalinist Anti-Semitism: It Is Not Yet Over — —

(Continued from page 1)

The press campaign against Jews resumed to a limited extent in the summer of 1955. *Unser Shtimme* reports the use by provincial Russian papers of unusual emphasis given to cases involving Jews—for example, by printing their full names and repeating them frequently, so that readers will be sure to "catch on." In at least one case, a Moscow paper did the same thing when it reported that "a Jew Isaac Moysherevitch swindled the government."

At the same time, the number of Jews prosecuted for economic offenses suddenly increased.

During 1955 a few Jewish prisoners were released. Tens of thousands are still confined, according to reports of former slave-labor camp inmates who have returned to Germany, Austria and other countries.

Semyon D. Ignatiev, the official of the Ministry of State Security that fabricated the infamous "Doctors' Plot," got off with a temporary demotion, but soon reappeared. In March 1954 he was elected to the Supreme Soviet, and in February 1956 the 20th Congress of the party re-elected him to the Central Committee.

CONFESSIONS

The 20th Congress, of course, was the scene of the violent denunciation of Stalin. While no one knows exactly what was said, the press has reported that the present leaders declared Stalin was personally anti-Semitic and that he grew more and more violently anti-Semitic as time went on.

According to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency (April 19), the Warsaw CP Jewish organ *Folkstimmme* printed an article saying that Beria had executed dozens of Jewish members of the Communist Party and armed forces, at the direct command of Joseph Stalin.

A London *Times* report of the "inside information" variety says that a story is making the rounds among the East European Stalinists: Khrushchev is supposed to have told party leaders that in 1953 Stalin proposed the establishment of a new Russian Pale (ghetto region) for the Jews in the northern part of the country. According to this report, Mikoyan and Molotov protested that such a step would arouse too much opposition.

The Russian historical journal *Problems of History* decried "anti-Semitic deviations under Stalin."

Not to be outdone, Premier Sirocky of Czechoslovakia had to confess too. He declared there had been certain evidences of anti-Semitism in the notorious Slansky trial, which had been marked not only by anti-Zionism, as claimed, but also by anti-Semitism.

The revelations about the Stalinist crimes on the Jewish question are only at their beginnings. Much more is still a mys-

tery about the fate of hundreds of thousands of Polish and Russian Jews. The relations between the GPU and the Gestapo in the extermination of the Jews of Eastern Europe is a subject that will have to wait further disclosures or an opening of the secret files of the GPU by a resurgent Russian workers' movement.

HE RECANTED

Even before the 20th Congress unconfirmed rumors were circulating that the Stalinist leaders had informed the nearest of kin that the Yiddish writers Peretz Markish and David Hofstein had been executed. There were no confirmations or denials of these reports, which grew so strong that they made an impact even on Stalinist-front intellectuals.

N. Maisel, editor of *Ikuf*, wrote an article in the organ of the Israeli party Ahduth Avodah saying that he could no longer remain silent. He had remained quiet and limited his inquiries to "inside" channels because he did not want to play into the hands of "anti-Soviet elements." He and others had raised questions about the fate of the Yiddish writers, respectfully, with Fadayeve, a high Russian culture-commissar who had denied the suppression of Yiddish culture and the arrest and execution of Yiddish writers. After the reversal of the "Doctors' Plot" case, Maisel's hopes grew, but nothing came of them. The head of the Stalinist cultural front then made a public appeal for information.

The local Stalinists met this in the usual way. Pressure was put on the doubters in many ways, primarily with the bogey that any criticism of Russia helps the reactionaries, etc. In the March issue of *Ikuf Bletter*, Maisel recanted.

MISSION TO MOSCOW

At the same time the Stalinist press began a campaign to show how Yiddish cultural activity was flourishing. The instances they cited were primarily in the satellite countries.

On February 12, the U. S. *Freiheit* reported that one minor Yiddish writer Bloystein had been seen alive. There were reports that the works of Markish and Bergelson would be put out in a memorial edition by the Union of Russian Writers.

A "memorial" edition for writers whom the Stalinists had not yet admitted to be dead? The impression was given that these works would be published in Yiddish. However, it turned out that Yiddish is still taboo. Their works will be published in translation only.

During this time Leon Crystal, staff correspondent of the *Jewish Daily Forward* (New York), visited Russia and in his reports confirmed the execution of more than thirty of the most gifted Jewish

writers in Russia. These murders are supposed to have taken place August 12, 1952.

Crystal reported that the authorities now called it a "miscarriage of justice," and the crime was put on the decapitated head of Beria, and laid to the insane terror of the last years of the Stalin regime.

Crystal also reported that during his stay (in 1956) there were regular trials—not spotlighted show-trials—of Jews arrested for possessing and reading Yiddish material. They were convicted and sentenced. He reports rumors of many other similar trials.

Crystal tells of statements by Russian officials to the effect that "if Stalin had not died there would have been no end to anti-Jewish persecution."

He could find no information about the committees that were supposed to publish Markish's works. No one in Russia seemed to know about it. (Later the *Freiheit* published a list of names.)

R-DAY

The day of revelation came on April 10, 1956. The Stalinist *Morning Freiheit* of New York for the first time openly and officially admitted the annihilation of Jewish secular culture in Russia and the physical purge of its creative writers and artists.

The entire front page of the paper was devoted to a reprint from the Warsaw *Folkstimmme*. The list of Yiddish writers executed contained the names not only of those who had disappeared in the late '40s but also a surprising number who had been missing since the '30s. It revealed that more than 50 artists had been executed. It is not recorded how many others were merely arrested, deported, or divorced from their creative work in other ways, or harassed. Their number is surely legion.

The entire blame is placed on the "Beria gang," who, in the "atmosphere of the cult of personality," destroyed Jewish secular culture and its representatives in Russia. Stalin's name is not mentioned—yet.

That Beria was associated in this crime—as a subordinate—is beyond doubt. The report, however, places the main responsibility on him. It is not explained how Beria could have been responsible for the liquidation of writers like Moïshe Litvak, editor of the defunct *Emess*, who disappeared in the '30s while Yagoda headed the secret police.

The report also blames the "cult of personality" for the liquidation of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee and the "sentencing of its leaders to destruction," despite the fact that some of these writers were high priests of the cult.

The entire emphasis of the report is designed to blame an individual, or individuals, and to whitewash the Stalinist

system. The faithful are being shielded from the thought that anti-Semitism could be bred and widely applied only in a society that needs it.

The rehabilitation of the Yiddish writers does not, however, seem to imply the restoration of Yiddish culture. One report is that Jewish local leaders were told to go to Biro-Bidjan if they want a Yiddish school or press. There is no move to permit even a Yiddish periodical or monthly—naturally, even a loyal Stalinist one. Moreover, as yet there is no indication that the Jews will be allowed to publish their own periodicals (loyal to the regime) in Russian or any other language.

STILL UNDER BAN

Even foreign Jewish publications are still prohibited to Jews in Russia. For the first time in years a Russian citizen may select from a list of 250 newspapers published in Iron Curtain countries: The *Folkstimmme*, published in nearby Warsaw, is not included.

There is also no evidence as yet that discrimination against Jews in the armed services, diplomatic corps, party apparatus has diminished.

In the satellite countries the situation is different. There Yiddish culture has been seriously hampered but not eliminated. The same is also true of the "incorporated areas"—the territories that Russia annexed as a result of the Hitler-Stalin pact and post-war seizures. In the satellite countries, there are still Yiddish theaters, press, lectures, etc. Complete Stalinization takes much time.

In these satellite countries, the fate of the Jews has fluctuated up and down in accordance with Russian foreign policy. As exemplified by Premier Sirocky's admission, the Stalinists never kept anti-Semitism out of their anti-Zionist politics. There have been ebbs and flows in the waves of arrests of Jews, and releases of Jews, mostly Zionists but not only so. The latest reports are that Rumania has released 200 Zionists, or almost all that were said to be in jail.

In Czechoslovakia, where Slansky is not being rehabilitated, the release is slower. The most famous prisoner is, of course, Mordecai Oren, a leader of the pro-Stalinist Mapam of Israel, who was convicted of engaging in a "Zionist-Trotskyist-Titoist" plot to overthrow the Czech government. Mapam and the Israel government had asked for his release, but there is no answer so far.

Humorists in Israel are now predicting that Oren will be tried, will confess, and will be found guilty of plotting the Stalinist "cult of personality."

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION — \$1 a year for Student Subs

BOOKS AND IDEAS

A History of the IWW

Movement with a Great Past

THE IWW, ITS FIRST 50 YEARS (1905-1955), compiled by Fred Thompson.—\$3 cloth, \$2 paperbound.

By BEN HALL

The IWW was the most ambitious effort to establish revolutionary industrial unionism in the United States; it was, in fact, the only sustained effort.

For 15 or 20 years, the peak period of its activity, a band of left-wing socialists, radicals and rebels, separated from the main body of the union movement, put up an amazing battle.

And it was, literally, a battle. They led scores of local strikes in days when union-smashing violence, private and governmental, came as a matter of course; strikes in unorganized sections of industry that were hard to win and impossible to keep organized even after victory.

They carried on incessant propaganda, by printed word and in action, for revolutionary industrial unionism; that is: for the organization of all workers in all industries, not only to fight for better living conditions, but to replace capitalism by socialism.

They showed that industrial unionism and the organization of the unorganized was possible. They helped to perpetuate the traditions of mass unionism and militant class action that were finally victorious with the CIO.

Two bourgeois labor historians, whose own viewpoint is distinctly anti-socialist, assess the impact of IWW activity at one critical point as follows:

"To the young American intelligentsia, Lawrence [IWW-led strike in 1912] was proof that a revolutionary American labor movement which had been forecast as inevitable in the theoretical socialist writings was here at last and deepened its dissatisfaction and impatience with

the leadership of the AFL."

The IWW, *Its First 50 Years* is this organization's official record, published by direction of its 1955 convention.

Apart from all other considerations, its value lies in this: it reminds us that the union-consciousness of the American working class, its readiness to fight, its spirit of organization handed down from generation to generation, were created and kept alive by the heroic activity and sacrifice of thousands of class-conscious, socialist-minded workers. The IWW had no monopoly on the job; but it did its share.

The book gives us the facts; but little more. The compiler-author, perhaps restrained by his official mandate, hardly bothers to assess a half-century of activity, except in trivial detail on outlived questions.

END OF A ROAD

The IWW was not organized as a mere propaganda group; nor did it limit its role to the organization of the unorganized. It aimed at nothing less than organizing the basic mass of American workers and supplanting the American Federation of Labor as the union movement.

Despite temporary local successes, despite the persistent, driving activity of its members and leaders, it failed. Its highest average membership, reports Thompson, was 40,000, a figure which it reached in 1923. Its effective strength is difficult to estimate; it combined dedicated revolutionaries with newly awakened unionists. In any case, its continuing membership never exceeded 40,000. Measured against the membership of the Socialist Party, a political movement and not a union, which rose to over 100,000, and to the union movement of the day which organized millions, the IWW never drew near its basic objective.

Was the direction of IWW activity correct? In any case, what is its role today when the working class is already organized?

NO REPLY

Once, the IWW gave an answer, in its pamphlet *The IWW in Theory and Practice*. Asking itself, "With the AFL and the CIO in existence, is the IWW needed as a labor organization?" it goes on to reply:

"In the first place, this question is wrong in implying that the AFL or the CIO is a labor organization. The fact that the AFL or the CIO is an organization composed of laborers does not make either of them a labor organization. A labor organization must be judged not by its personnel but by its objectives... so... the AFL or the CIO is an army of laborers not for labor but for capital."

If true, such a judgment would drive us to the depressing conclusion that the working class in all its years of struggle has proved utterly unable to organize itself. Luckily, this is absurd. The class struggle and the organization of labor as a class continues. The working class supports capitalism, yes. But at the same time it defends its own class interests.

In its new book, the IWW simply evades the whole question, it makes no attempt to define the nature of the AFL-CIO or to analyze its own relation to it. The IWW has become a mere propaganda group—can it present itself as an alternative to the AFL-CIO? can it persist in writing off the real labor movement as a fake and a fraud? From this book: no reply.

IT COULDN'T SKIP

Why did the IWW fail? It seems obvious now that the task is set for itself, the organization of the mass of American workers at the turn of the century, was far beyond its powers. And not beyond the IWW's alone.

The trade-union movement failed no less: in steel, oil, rubber, packinghouse; auto, every attempt to organize, whether radical or respectable, was defeated. The consolidating trusts were too powerful; the government, too openly lined up at their side.

A generation of struggles and the great depression which discredited big business had to come before the victories of the working class became possible. Thompson writes, "This period [early 1900s] should make plain that in all these fields—textiles, rubber, autos, out-of-town construction and whatever the IWW hit—it was there simply because all those who disdainfully spoke of IWW instability, had proven even more unable to organize than were the Wobblies."

In explaining how unionism fell apart in Butte, Thompson comments, "it seems that failure to maintain a union came chiefly because somehow those who favored it figured it hopeless." Thus a mood of defeat pervades the air. The enemy was too strong.

In those days, it was possible to ascribe the backwardness of the union movement to other factors. If only a union movement were founded on real class-struggle principles, if only socialists could come out from the stifling control of "AFLism" if only we could get rid of politics—then victory would be assured. But this was an illusion.

If it were possible to crack the big monopolies, organize the unorganized, and build permanent mass unions, it could be done only by amassing the united power of the existing labor movement. But the IWW sought to skip over the real union movement.

It drew a line between itself and unions which supported capitalism, and insisted that revolutionary unions be organized apart from and against the existing unions.

It saw itself as a rival to socialistic unions which remained in the AFL. In

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

A. T.

'The Man Who Never Died'

THE MAN WHO NEVER DIED. A Play About Joe Hill, with Notes on Joe Hill and His Times, by Barrie Stavis. 1954. Haven Press.

Joe Hill was one of those men whose simple heroism figures so largely in the history of the IWW. His songs were sung everywhere on the picket lines and in the union halls.

On November 18, 1915, just before he was shot, he wired Bill Haywood from his prison cell in Salt Lake City: "It is only a hundred miles from here to Wyoming. Could you arrange to have my body hauled to the state line to be buried? I don't want to be found dead in Utah."

The author has written a play based upon Hill's frame-up, trial and execution. It is introduced with 116 pages of notes that assemble the known facts about the trial, after extensive research in the literature and documents of the times. This is an invaluable task, for all records relating to the trial have dis-

appeared from the office of the county Unionism in the Western metal mines at the turn of the century has been called "fronter" unionism to mark it as unique and to set its experience apart as exceptional. But in the fury it aroused in the ruling class, its story is typical.

In Utah, the Western Federation of Miners, a union which endorsed socialism, and later the IWW led strikes and built unions in the teeth of bitter opposition from copper-mining companies. Later, unionism was literally driven out by troops, police, and armed vigilantes under government protection.

Hill's execution was part of the pattern. The facts of the frame-up are here in the introduction; an imaginary version, in the play.

If the legal execution typified the power and ruthlessness of anti-unionism, the nation-wide wave of protest with international repercussions foreshadowed the great unity of the American working class which finally established unionism. Stavis has recorded these facts, too.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

On Vocabulary

To the Editor:

There was once a time when Independent Socialists could use the words *Stalinism* and *Stalinist* to designate the Russian social system, its regime, the Communist Parties, etc., without fear of misunderstanding. The ordinary (politically conscious) American would hear a reference to "Stalinism," and after a moment's reflection on the esoteric word, easily translate it to the more familiar "Communism."

The main value of *Stalinism* and its variants was to distinguish the totalitarian collectivism of Stalin's counter-revolution from the communism of Marx, Lenin, etc. In the last few weeks, these words have lost their exotic flavor and have appeared in every issue of the daily press. In doing so, they have acquired a totally different meaning, so that in the popular mind, LABOR ACTION and *Izvestia* are both "anti-Stalinist" journals.

At the same time as Independent Socialists emphasize that the Stalinist social system has not changed substantially, it is time for them to change their

vocabulary and severely limit the use of the confusing "Stalinism," etc. To continue, in the face of a contrary general understanding of the terms, to use them, would be a badge of sectarianism.

We already have the technical term "bureaucratic collectivism" to indicate the social system of Russia, China, and the satellites. For general political usage, I believe our best solution would be to overcome the squeamishness about using the term *Communism* in a derogatory sense, and to realize that in the foreseeable future it will be identified with Stalinism and only with Stalinism.

If LABOR ACTION were to start using *Communism* and *Communist* in their accepted meanings, a few left romantics would undoubtedly accuse LA in its own way of having sold out the Russian Revolution, the First International, and god knows what else. A handful of idiots may conclude (as they probably will anyway) that Khrushchev and Co. have actually overthrown Stalinism and established a workers democracy. But this would be a small price for making this excellent paper 5 per cent more intelligible.

principle, it opposed the coexistence of socialist and pro-capitalist unions within the same federation. Was this correct? The old IWW pamphlet which we have referred to carries this line to ludicrous conclusions:

"Both the AFL and CIO separate labor on a more intense and larger chaotic scale now than ever before. The IWW, on the contrary, organizes more industrially now than ever before."

The more industrially it organizes, the fewer members. And the more the AFL-CIO "separates" the workers, the more united they tend to become. The latest book gives only passing attention to the whole question.

PRE-NATAL INJECTION

However, in speaking of the call to the January 2, 1905 IWW conference, it comments, "In retrospect, it appears that they erected a barrier to size, by this pre-natal injection of revolutionary theory." Here, in a casual phrase, the author calls into question the basic line that guided the IWW. But he doesn't seem to notice it.

Throughout its history, the IWW tried to combine two clashing roles. It wanted to become a mass union movement and it wanted to remain a distinct ideological tendency, in effect, a political grouping with an anti-political line. It was an impossible combination and led to ever-recurring internal difficulties, some of them documented in this book.

By now, however, the IWW has been stripped of every union attribute and lives on as a propaganda group. But what kind of propaganda group can it be?

There is room—more, there is need—for a left wing inside the labor movement striving to keep alive the spirit of working-class independence and socialism. The IWW can hardly fulfill that role by clinging to the memories of yesterday.

Its latest book is a valuable compilation of memories. But it needs a better guide for the future.

SHELLEY ABRAMS

On behalf of all his comrades and coworkers, and all of the many personal friends he made in California, we want to pay tribute to his memory.

We will remember him always as a dedicated worker for humanity and socialism. We will remember always his integrity, his earnest labor, his joy in work, the strength of his confidence in the socialist cause.

We will remember always his honest affection for people, his kind and gentle spirit.

We will remember always his exceptional abilities, and his promise for the future, which was not to be fulfilled.

We will remember him always with an undiminished sense of loss.

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE
of Los Angeles



LABOR ACTION

April 30, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 18

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

YSL FUND DRIVE

We Can't Afford To Slow Up!

By MAX MARTIN

The money received by the national office during the second three weeks of the Young Socialist League's 1956 drive to raise \$1475 amounted to considerably less than what came in during the opening period. \$199 has been remitted by the units since the last report, raising the total collected to date to \$595, or 40 per cent of the total.

The national standing to date is not a bad one; indeed it represents the point we should be at in this stage of the drive. If the weekly average established so far keeps up, the YSL will achieve its quota in full and on time.

But what has to be borne in mind is that these results are what they are because of the exceptionally fine showing made in the weeks right after the drive opened, and that since then a tendency to slow down has set in. If this trend is not reversed in the coming period the drive will enter a danger zone.

New York and Los Angeles have held on to first and second place respectively, the former having over 50 per cent of its quota in and the latter being exactly at the half-way mark. Both of these units have been doing an outstanding job, as has also Albany, which took a large leap into third place, sending one-third of its quota to the N. O. Chicago, with 30 per cent of its goal already behind it, is also doing an excellent job, especially considering the financial difficulties the comrades in that city have.

With the exception of "At Large & National Office," none of the other units has remitted any funds since the last drive report. The comrades in these areas, and especially those two which have not yet sent in anything, should start rectifying this situation at once. Our aim should be for all areas to complete 50 per cent of their quotas by the time of the next report, three weeks hence.

Challenge readers are urged to do their share. Make your checks and money orders payable to Max Martin and send them to YSL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

WHAT'S THE SCORE?

City	Quota	Paid	%
Total	\$1475	\$595	40.3
New York	600	340	56.7
Los Angeles	150	75	50.0
Albany	75	25	33.3
Chicago	350	105	30.0
Berkeley	75	20	26.7
Antioch	25	5	20.0
At Lge. & N.O.	100	20	20.0
Cleveland Area	25	5	20.0
Pittsburgh	50	0	0.0
San Francisco	25	0	0.0

Are You in Favor of COLLECTIVE READERSHIP?

COME AND COLLECT New York YSL's BOOK BAZAAR

Bizarre bargains... also political pamphlets, records, prints.

Fri., MAY 11 at 8:30 p.m.
LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

TWO WEEKS

have already gone by since the YSL challenged the Labor Youth League to debate "The Meaning of the 20th Party Congress." No reply yet. . . .

Big Student Strike in Mexico

By JOHN WORTH

Mexico City, Apr. 21

The Mexican student movement, one of the most powerful in the world, faces its most serious challenge since 1950 as a strike of 47,000 Polytechnic students moves into its third week.

Sparked by the existence of a situation in which there is a lack of funds to maintain classes at the School of Electrical and Mechanical Engineering past the first month (the school year begins in March), the Federacion Nacional de Estudiantes Tecnicos (FNET) declared the strike, closed classrooms throughout the country, published a 7-point manifesto attacking the corrupt and graft-ridden school administration, and demanded immediate implementation of long-standing promises for classrooms, housing, and full-time, competent instruction.

Response was immediate. Within hours trigger-happy plainclothesmen invaded student quarters and wounded four students in a free-for-all, while metropolitan newspapers—the "free press"—opened a bitter campaign of distortion and witch-hunting far in advance of McCarthy.

"COMMUNISM IN POLYTECHNIC" was the theme, embroidered by more sensational dailies with details of the "red arsenal," secret juntas where hair-raising decisions were made, and the whole "red plot" unfolded.

SOLID UNITY

One or two mass skirmishes between students and policemen took place, but police, apparently under orders to avoid provocation, contented themselves with incidental arrests and harassment. An effort to arrest delegates to the National Strike Committee, meeting with representatives of the Federacion de Estudiantes Universitarios (FEU) at the School of Anthropology, failed when student leaders, taking advantage of the adjacent museum, slipped past the police cordon in ones and twos.

Without question, one of the most sig-

nificant factors in the "hands-off" policy has been the pact of unity signed by the FEU and the FNET, in which the two organizations, commanding the allegiance of over 100,000 students throughout the country, agreed to mutual support in significant disputes, and formed the National Council for Student Unity.

FEU, responding to the petition of the FNET, declared full moral support, and placed itself in permanent session with a definite commitment to strike in case of infringement of student rights or deliberate provocation by the police.

Meanwhile the strike had been spreading. The School of Anthropology responded to FNET's invitation to join the strike and submitted petitions of its own.

Shortly afterward, the Rural Normal School, the Agricultural Institute, the Physical Training Institute, all relatively small and isolated schools, declared themselves on strike and submitted petitions embodying their own special needs. Representatives from technical schools in other main centers arrived with delegations to assist in the strike action.

MASS MARCH

Well into the second week no action had been taken by the authorities, especially the secretary of Education, to whom the petitions were addressed. Evidently a wait-and-see policy had been adopted while newspapers increased their pressure, and two professional "anti-Communist youth" organizations

Go 'Way, Jackson

Los Angeles, Apr. 15

The Los Angeles Unit of the Young Socialist League is participating in a joint socialist-pacifist campaign against the hearings which will be held by the House Un-American Activities Committee on "subversion" in Local 47 of the Musicians Union during the week beginning April 16.

Sponsoring the campaign are the Los Angeles branches of the Socialist Party, the Young People's Socialist League, the Youth Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the YSL.

The joint action was undertaken in response to the announcement that the "Jackson Committee" was coming to Los Angeles to investigate the Musicians Union and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, the latter headed by Harry Bridges.

Plans being made by the four organizations preparing to protest the hearing call for distribution of leaflets every afternoon while the hearings are in session in front of the federal building where they are being held, and a poster-walk demonstration on Saturday, April 21.

were resurrected in an attempt to divide the students.

Doubt concerning the solidity and discipline of the strikers was dispelled, however, with the mass demonstration of Thursday, April 19, the tenth day of the strike. Over ten thousand students rallied and marched through the main sections of the city and in front of the Presidential Palace without a single incident.

Marchers maintained perfect order, and compelled grudging compliment from the police chief, Miguel Molinar, standing-by with the trifling complement of three mounted squadrons, a battalion of riot-police, a motorized squadron, 500 secret agents, and 23 police companies—"ready for any emergency."

The newspapers, notoriously hard to please, reported a "rowdy" demonstration, and devoted columns to the "Communist" character of banners and placards. Other newspapers reported, contradictorily, that multitudes of "Communist" slogans had been retired at the last moment, and it was hinted that the city was barely saved from destruction when workers' combat squads decided to spend the day at home.

EXPECT TO WIN

It is useless to deny that the Young Communists and affiliates of Lombardo Toledano's Partido Popular have been active in the strike. However, the nearly unanimous character of most strike votes, the evident awareness of issues, and the solidity of the mass demonstration prove that the demands of the FNET are the demands of the overwhelming majority of the students.

Absolutely no attempt has been made to inject political issues into the strike. Indeed, the pro-regime character of Lombardo and the CP renders Stalinist agitation extremely improbable.

At the present moment the pseudo-youth organizations which were set up, and a rival FEU, have had notably small

(Continued on page 6)

SHELLEY ABRAMS

There is a terrible sense of shock and loss and great grief in our hearts. Our comrade and friend, Shelley Abrams, is dead.

Shelley, whose tragic end came at the age of twenty-five, was found dead in his apartment in Santa Monica, California, on April 20. His death was accidental, caused by carbon monoxide poisoning from several gas appliances, together with inadequate ventilation.

During all of his adult life Shelley had been an outstanding fighter for socialist freedom. He joined the Socialist Youth League in Chicago in 1951, and almost from the first days of his membership gave evidence of exceptional talents and abilities, which he was ready and anxious to place at the service of the socialist cause. He gave unstintingly of his energy and devotion in the struggle for socialism, developing into a capable socialist youth leader.

When the Young Socialist League was formed in 1954, Shelley began to play a prominent role in its Chicago unit, as well as in campus and student activities in that city. During the major part of 1955 he served as organizer of the Chicago YSL. Comrade Shelley was also an active member of the Independent Socialist League.

After last year's YSL national convention, in which he participated actively, Shelley went to Los Angeles, where he immediately became an activist in the YSL unit. During the past few months he had devoted himself to work among UCLA students, playing an important role in the expansion of socialist education and activity among young people there. His optimism and effectiveness were equal and astonishing. Every free moment that he had was given to politi-

cal work—work which will still go forward. This is the only kind of tribute that Shelley would have wanted.

Everywhere Shelley went he made a host of friends. He was known and loved not only in those cities where he had resided, Chicago and Los Angeles, but by socialist students and young workers throughout the country. His honesty, his integrity, his dedication, his joy in life and work, his scorn and hatred of fraud and deceit and oppression made their marks on all with whom he came in contact.

Shelley would have had only contempt for the efforts which reactionary forces made to attempt to use his death to besmirch socialism. The Police Department tried to cloud the obvious facts surrounding his tragic death, supplying the yellow capitalist press with sensational hints of "violent death" during two days of so-called "investigation." The press made much of the socialist literature and books found in his apartment and even quoted some of his personal correspondence with the YSL national office, in an attempt to create a witchhunting atmosphere at the University of California at Los Angeles.

But the case has finally been officially closed. His comrades and friends will see to it that reactionaries take no advantage of it.

The struggle for socialist emancipation, which meant everything to Shelley, will go on. We dedicate ourselves to this, as Shelley dedicated himself to it, and as he would want us to do—the only kind of respect for his memory that he would be interested in.

But we have lost an irreplaceable comrade. Farewell, Shelley.

Coming in New York

An exclusive showing of the great historical documentary

"TSAR TO LENIN"

Time and place to be announced

REPORT ON THE UAW EDUCATION CONFERENCE

'VANGUARD' with a WHISPER

By BEN HALL

"You cannot have Mr. Eastland and have us at the same time. No party that joins such incompatible forces is worthy of the support of the American people."

The words were directed to the leadership of the Democratic Party. The speaker was Walter Reuther.

It was the closing ten minutes of the UAW Educational Conference in Washington. He was winding up a stirring one-hour address. Without introductory warning he told the 3000 auto delegates:

"The Democratic Party in 1956 is at the crossroads . . . it is a simple and obvious fact. Overwhelmingly its leadership is committed to the New Deal and Fair Deal. But these principles must be applied today clearly and without compromise. . . . If it takes the easy way of compromise and convenience it cannot win and it has no right to win."

For this brief moment, the real life of politics was allowed to intrude, and the conference ended on April 24 with a gigantic question mark. Only an hour before, Adlai Stevenson, invited guest, had addressed the crowd. He didn't hint at such delicate matters. Yet they cheered.

What Reuther found to be so "simple and obvious," just as his listeners were about to go home, had been mentioned by no one since the time they had arrived three days before. For all anyone knew until the very end, 1956 was no different from 1952.

The UAW took a good look back into the past. But while it recalled with pride the heroes who fought in the sit-in strikes of the thirties, it ignored today's heroes, those who fight in the Deep South.

On this critical issue of our day, the UAW failed; it failed to instill in its members the significance of the Southern Negro's struggle for equality; it failed to speak out clearly against the enemies of democracy, like Eastland; it failed to repudiate false friends to it like Hill and Sparkman, men whom it had supported for election and who in return endorsed the Congressional Manifesto for white supremacy.

It was left to Thurgood Marshall,

CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 5)

success in dividing the students. The authorities have carefully refrained from a definite commitment on the strike; and divisive attempts having failed, the chances of a positive outcome seem excellent.

The principle demands embodied in FNET's petition have already been granted in principle, and may be implemented without loss of face, though a few bureaucratic heads may fall. There has been little provocation, and consequently no bitterness, on either side.

The carefully stated pact of unity, as well as support from a substantial section of the faculty, presents a solid front which obviates a violent strikebreaking tactic. It is highly doubtful that the government desires, or could gain from, an open clash with the student organizations. Even Nicandro Mendoza, president of FNET and a CP member, has publicly stated that the government is doing a splendid job in building the educational system of Mexico.

Barring unexpected developments it appears that the students will win their struggle, and that the student organizations, forged in the bitter conflict of 1950-51, will maintain and stabilize themselves.

The character of their latest action demonstrates that the students of Mexico are themselves the most serious proponents and defenders of their educational system. By so doing they demonstrate the maturity of their organization, and their right to participate in the future of Mexico.

NAACP counsel, to speak a few glaring truths.

PAGEANT

The conference celebrated twenty years of the UAW. A pageant opened the sessions, re-enacting in song, pictures and skits the great working-class struggles that culminated in the rise of the CIO; UAW activists watched a portrayal of the early heartbreaking defeats; then the big sit-in strikes; the beating of Reuther and Frankenstein in the Ford "battle of the overpass;" the Memorial Day killings of steel strikers; and then the big victories that established the union in the thirties and the massive wave of strikes that solidified this victory in the post-war period. It was truly moving.

It lacked one thing: it failed utterly to depict the inner life of the union, the democracy, the caucus life, the debates and convention fights which set the UAW apart as the symbol of union democracy. It ignored the democratically fought battle to defeat the Communist Party and its influence. It brought no reminder that the union was not all along run by a smoothly organized administration and that it was not only in its fight against the big corporations but through its inner debates that the UAW became what it is.

HOW ABOUT TODAY?

Nevertheless, it was inspiring. Three thousand men and women, ordinarily busy with their daily union tasks back home or tied to their job at the machine, could pause for a moment and say: This is what we did; these are the mighty corporations that we defeated; this is how we brought a measure of democracy into industry. They could take pride in themselves; they could feel their power; they could respect their union.

That was the first day.

Three days later in a ringing conclusion Reuther inspired his followers with a vision of a better tomorrow—a fully guaranteed annual wage—industrial democracy—the brotherhood of man—ever higher pensions. And finally, high on the list of coming demands, a shorter workweek.

That was the last day.

But what to do now? Between the bow to the past and the call for the future—was nothing.

Here was the glaring omission; for the key political issue of the day was evaded. As far as this conference went, there might have been no looming split in the Democratic Party; no irreconcilable conflict between democracy and racism in the South. Except that a formal award was presented to Thurgood Marshall for his services to liberalism and democracy.

MISREPRESENTATION

Apparently only one lesson had been planned in advance: elect Democrats in 1956! But time and the Negro struggle in the South have made this reply obsolete.

On Monday morning the delegates, in small groups, had breakfast with their congressmen. At least 100 congressmen replied to questions as they ate eggs and drank coffee. Here, no doubt, it was intended that auto workers would learn to vote right.

On Monday afternoon, they heard a formal debate between top-ranking representatives of the two parties. Estes Kefauver and Hubert Humphrey spoke for the Democrats; William Knowland and Senator Carl T. Curtis (Neb.) for the Republicans. No one noticed that the dice were loaded.

A union crew must have hauled a steam shovel to a nearby park. There



WALTER REUTHER

they turned up fragments of a mammoth tusk. Somewhat deeper they dug into a petrified dinosaur egg. And then they ran into Senator Curtis of Nebraska. He came along with Knowland to present the Republican side.

Curtis was a distilled-pure old-line Republican. He wouldn't tolerate socialistic measures like federal aid to education; if the national government built local school houses we would be on the swift road to a police state.

Humphrey and Kefauver were different. Those who worked up the program deserve credit for effort and zeal. To select liberals who thunder loud and clear at labor gatherings (having stored up energy for the occasion) it was necessary to discard the chief Democratic leaders in Congress.

Thus although this was an "educational" conference, there was no education on basic political truths. If Knowland, leader of the Republican Party, was chosen for his side, why not choose Lyndon Johnson, Senate leader of the Democratic Party, or Sam Rayburn, top Democrat in the House? But they had to be overlooked. While they truly represented the Democratic Party in Congress, they were not at all satisfactory to UAW leaders.

The Democratic Party, its true role in Congress, its dominating figures were not truly depicted. To stimulate support for the party in 1956, it was necessary to misrepresent it.

DEMAGOGUE

Knowland spoke like a distinguished gentleman, and Curtis (as he said) like a farm boy. But it was a feeble effort. They rested their case on prosperity and free enterprise.

Kefauver and Humphrey rode hard on the theme that "the Republican Party has traditionally been the willing handmaiden of Big Business interests," stirring up every active and latent hostility to the monopolists. And here was the crowd for it.

Humphrey, a shrewd opportunist sensitive to the turning mood of our times, said, "I don't believe the Democratic Party can win by trying to be as conservative as the Republicans or even trying to be as socially acceptable as the Republicans. I think that we've got to lay the issues on the line—we've got to challenge the administration that's in power and we've got to project a program that means something to the American people."

He made it sound fine except . . . there was no program.

Humphrey wowed them. He recited statistics of huge mounting profits for big business; he decried the decline of the small businessman and bemoaned the rising number of bankruptcies; he viewed with alarm the growth of merger and monopoly; he felt deeply for the farmer, skinned by the food trust.

It was so impressive that one forgot,

just for that half hour, that the poor Republicans have held office for only 4 years; that prices soared, monopolies rose, small business declined under the Democratic administration and neither Humphrey nor any of his friends had proposed a way to stop it. There was no one to remind the delegates of such elementary facts.

Surely not the Republicans. In their rebuttals, Knowland and Curtis skirted around the issues feebly and fatily.

BRUSHOFF

Asked by Curtis why the Democrats had done nothing to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, Humphrey replied: give us the votes of 15 Republican Senators and you'll see how quickly we'll do it. It was a devastating retort except—he couldn't dig up 35 Democrats to go along.

Remember: This was a debate between top leaders of the two parties. While they talk from a UAW platform, a critical fight for democracy is going on in the South. Where do they stand?

It is almost incredible, but the Republicans said literally nothing about it. That made it easy for the Democrats.

Humphrey brushed over it, beginning: "I imagine before this day is done, somebody will mention this all-important, very highly controversial and yet such vital subject of civil rights." It was clear that he didn't want to talk about it; but he had to, because he was afraid that someone else might bring it up.

He needn't have feared the Republicans. He took a stand foursquare for civil-rights legislation; but he had no words left to attack Eastland and the segregationists.

A victory for the Democratic Party means domination of Congress by the conservative South; it means Eastland to head the Senate Judiciary Committee; it means anti-labor Barden of North Carolina to head the House Labor Committee. No one pressed him and he did not volunteer a reply. But the audience applauded.

THE INAUDIBLE VOICE

Membership participation was down to a bare minimum, lowest of any national UAW gathering. The delegates were there to soak up what was prepared; they watched performances; they listened to speeches. Everything was professionally staged. They had one chance to sing "Solidarity Forever" but not much opportunity to speak.

A dozen-odd questions were briefly prepared by groups of delegates for the Senator-debaters. The Republicans answered with a frank anti-union bias, a good object lesson for those who might need it. The Democrats parried embarrassing queries with ease in an audience of sympathizers.

On the critical question of civil rights everyone said "Obey the law." Stevenson decried "racial tension." Humphrey said that the Democratic convention would endorse the Supreme Court decision. But there was no condemnation of the racists, no indictment of their allies who had signed the manifesto for white supremacy.

There was no word of encouragement for the Montgomery boycotters, no praise for those brave Southern Negroes who fight for the right to vote in the face of terror, no salute to those who have already died down South in the fight for democracy.

This was the UAW, meeting in 1956 while a fight between democracy and reaction goes on.

The vanguard in America? But not a vanguard in the struggle for democratic rights in the South today. For the first time when the chips were down, the voice of the UAW was almost inaudible.

That was the underlying failure of the conference.

NEW YORK READERS: NOTE FOR MAY DAY

The IWW and Libertarians are holding their May Day meeting on Tuesday, May 1, at 8 p. m., at Libertarian Center—813 Broadway (11-12 Streets).

Speakers from the Independent Socialist League and Young Socialist League have also been invited, in addition to the sponsoring groups plus the SIA and the War Resisters League. Ben Hall will speak for the ISL, and Michael Harrington for the YSL.

Readers of LABOR ACTION are urged to attend.

STALINISM WITHOUT STALIN—5

The Bevanite Theory Of the Russian Turn

By HAL DRAPER

There have been few serious efforts to raise questions about the social forces underlying the Khrushchev regime's new line, as distinct from the usual Russian expert's attempt to decode personal conflicts in the Kremlin hierarchy. Among these few is the type of analysis being made by the British Bevanites, including Aneurin Bevan himself. It therefore deserves and demands discussion*

This Bevanite theory of Stalinism already appeared in Bevan's book *In Place of Fear* in 1952, i.e., well before Stalin's death. Already in this book, and with reference to Stalin's regime, Bevan was arguing that the Russian workers' "economic enfranchisement is proceeding" because of industrialization, and "political enfranchisement must follow."

As these phrases indicate, it is a theory which, on the surface, seems to be one of mechanical and direct correspondence between "economics" and "politics"—as mechanical a theory as any ever imputed to Marxism by its enemies. But Bevan has not derived it from his own rather dubious attachment to Marxism.

This has long been the theoretical rationalization of the Bevanites' illusions about Stalinist democratization. The illusions are rooted not in the theory, however, but in neutralist yearnings for a peaceful accommodation or deal between the two rival camps of imperialism.

Before one can fight enthusiastically for such a foreign-policy line, it must first be considered possible; and a certain number of illusions about both capitalism and Stalinism are necessary before one can visualize the resolution of the cold war through a reconciliation of the contestants.

The illusions about capitalism tend to the reformist; the illusions about Russia tend to the Stalinoid; hence the characteristic mixture of Stalinoid reformism which is so strong an ingredient of neutralism even though it sounds to some like a contradiction in terms.

EFFICIENCY EXPERTS

Hence, in their reaction to the 20th Congress, the Bevanites hailed the new turn against Stalin as a working-out of this inevitable process of "political enfranchisement" out of "economic enfranchisement."

In a front-page editorial leader-article (February 24), the editors of *Tribune* rejoiced that "The Khrushchev message . . . can be summed up in three words: *Think for yourselves!*" and pointed out with some awe: "To dismantle a dictatorship from within is a task never previously attempted in history." They do not quite say that the Khrushchev regime is attempting this dismantling, but it is implied.

Now, why? It will take years, say the Bevanite editors—

"But the motive power for change is still strong and rooted in practical necessities. Khrushchev is first and last an organizer, interested in efficiency and production."

He travels around and "meets men like himself fretting under the yoke of theories, or schemes of organization, which must be right because Stalin said so but which obviously don't work."

"He finds factories geared to paper plans, farms producing poor crops in obedience to absurd notions in biology, laboratories making no new discoveries because to ask basic questions would cast doubt on some footnote to the works of Engels."

This picture of the dedicated, almost non-political efficiency expert who is interested only in maximizing production is a taking one. We shall try to point out that it has a real basis. But as presented by *Tribune*, it seems to have little relation to truth.

*This Bevanite theory is obviously greatly influenced by the ideas of Isaac Deutscher (for which, see Max Shachtman's discussion in the *New Internationalist*) but in this article we shall discuss it without reference to Deutscher.

Item: Khrushchev's agrarian program was a flop, indeed, but no one has asserted before that its failure was due to Lysenkoist notions of biology.

Item: On other occasions *Tribune* can be more lyrical about Russian scientific progress, and in any case, the reference to footnotes in Engels as impeding such progress is particularly unfortunate; for it was precisely Stalin who has publicly and officially discarded whole theories by Engels, not to speak of footnotes.

Item: The Bevanites do not quite tell us what is this "economic enfranchisement" of the masses of which they speak as if it were a reality. It would appear from other passages that they mean it to apply to the bureaucracy only, that is, to the ruling class, not to the masses, though this is not made clear when they make their big and impressive historical generalization about economics and politics.

But even as far as the bureaucracy is concerned, we all have now learned from the 20th Congress that there was no such "enfranchisement" under Stalin—and we must again recall without invidiousness that Bevan developed this theory of galloping "economic enfranchisement" about Stalin's regime.

THE THOUGHT THAT DAWNED

But isn't it true that what the Bevanites are really trying to say, in their (to us) exaggerated fashion, is precisely what we have said about the basic contradiction in this bureaucratic collectivist society?—namely, the contradiction between the economic planning needs of the society and the throttling totalitarian straitjacket on the managers.

Yes, this is true, and this is (from our particular view) the solid kernel of the Bevanite theory.

What the Bevanites do is to transform this phenomenon, which is a basic contradiction of the system, into a conscious idea in the minds of benevolent despots.

Thus the *Tribune* article, from which we have already quoted about Khrushchev's motivations, continues as follows:

"The thought dawned on him that laborers digging a canal with spades—and in 1930 there was no other way—can work without thinking, but men who wield the complex tools of modern science cannot. . . ." (Italics added.)

And later: "The growing army of Soviet technicians—like the French middle class in the Revolution—will not forever be content to be excluded from political influence."

Thus, we see, the new line is made vivid as a thought which "dawns" on the Kremlin masters—something they hadn't realized before. This could make an interesting novel, but it is more difficult to make history out of it.

The fact is that all the way back to the '30s, and before, the bureaucratic leaders from Stalin down showed themselves perfectly aware of this modern economic need for initiative, flexibility, and responsible leadership down below. They passed scheme after scheme to bring it into being—from above. The basic contradiction is precisely between their need for it (consciously realized) and the impossibility of bringing it about by their methods—that is, without giving up their political power as a ruling stratum.

MIKOYAN AND KAGANOVITCH

Before going further, let us see how this theory is developed by Bevan in response to the 20th Congress (*Tribune*, March 9):

"In place of the comparatively simple and primitive communities in which Stalin spent much of his life there has

grown up a highly diversified society where the professional and technical classes occupy positions of decisive importance in the national economy. . . . Against such a social background the personal caprice of an all-powerful tyrant had become intolerable."

He says "it is no accident" that Mikoyan took the lead in denouncing Stalin, for as minister in the field of trade and commerce Mikoyan is well acquainted with the deleterious economic effects of Stalin's concentration of power.

Mikoyan's role may well be all that is claimed, but this explains little. The man who has played the biggest role for the Kremlin in troubleshooting industry is not Mikoyan but Kaganovitch, who really has the reputation of being the crack "organizer" of the hierarchy. And Kaganovitch (say the same experts who tell us about Mikoyan's role) is the "die-hard Stalinist," or at least the one most opposed to Mikoyan's tendency.

Furthermore, it is not very relevant to compare Russia's present industrialization with the backward Russia of Stalin's childhood in Georgia.

QUESTION OF CLASSES

And we must note that Bevan is explicitly talking not of the Russian workers as the elements of change, but of the ranks of the bureaucratic managers. These make up the new revolutionary "class," for him, playing a role analogous to that of the bourgeoisie in the French revolution.

Who then constitutes the ruling class which is to be eliminated? Presumably, the members of the Presidium. This "class" would be peculiar enough, but we must remember, at this point, that it is the top leaders (*Tribune* told us) who are themselves engaged in dismantling the dictatorship.

Bevan has an historical analogy to reconcile all this. Having compared the Russian "revolutionary class" (the bureaucracy itself!) with the bourgeoisie of 1789, he goes on to paint the future in terms of the peaceful extension of the franchise which took place in England. Of course, in England, this relatively peaceful extension of bourgeois democratic institutions took place long after the consummation of the English bourgeois revolution. But Bevan does not mention that the English bourgeoisie also had to fight for its power—such things take place in other countries only like France.

And so out of this historical muddle it is implied that, whereas the bureaucracy is the rising "middle class," the forms of democracy will be leaked down below, from the top, on the model of the polite contests between the British Whigs and Tories.

Once again, it is interesting and instructive to observe this underpinning of Stalinoid illusions with social-reformist ideology.

A MATTER OF REVOLUTION

The big point about how "economic enfranchisement" (industrialization) must inevitably bring about "political enfranchisement" (democratization) turns out, then, to be an historical abstraction. We can go along with it for a considerable distance; all that it leaves out is a little matter like—revolution.

The basic contradiction of the Stalinist system will indeed eventually burst the integument of the totalitarian society. Will this necessary transformation be made from above or from below? What class is the carrier of this revolutionary need—the ruling class, in its impartial benevolence, or the exploited classes of workers and peasants?

The Bevanite theory jumps without analysis from the presentation of the social need to the assumption that the ruling class must satisfy that social need; and that this is what is now happening. This is exactly the hallmark of reformism.

This jump, this yawning chasm in the reformist ideology, may be plausible to

many when applied to bourgeois-democratic regimes, but when applied to Stalinism it is more difficult to swallow.

The Bevanites will have to show reasonable people some better evidence that blood-stained despots (Bevan has no illusions about their character) can be expected to become builders of democracy, and dismantle their own power and privileges, simply out of their ineffable attachment to technical efficiency.

A COUPLE OF PROPHECIES

For example, go back in the *Tribune* lead editorial to the point where "the thought dawns on" Khrushchev. The next paragraph in this novel actually says, just as if it followed logically—

"He [Khrushchev] began to realize, too, that once the people are allowed to think and make decisions about ways of working, they will do the same about the rewards of work and the conditions in which they live. It is both or neither—and the Soviet leaders have decided for both." (Italics added.)

The dilemma which this paragraph points out is indeed the crux of the question. "Democratization" cannot stop with giving a measure of "political enfranchisement" to the managerial bureaucracy. "The people"—who are somewhat broader than the bureaucracy, by some tens of millions—will want to have a say about "rewards." This is what happens to be the center of the class struggle in every exploiting society—"rewards."

This class struggle is not solely directed against the "class" which Bevanistically consists of the few members of the Presidium. It is directed against the real ruling class, the bureaucracy, including the managers who are supposed to be the (Bevanite) "middle class" of Russia. These are the bosses in the factories, the whip-wielders on the collective farms, the officer caste in the army.

What stands in the way, then, of an easy theory of "democratization from above for the sake of economic efficiency" is the consideration that the ruling class will lose its power. This is known as a revolution. The *Tribune* editors make this revolution with a phrase: "and the Soviet leaders have decided for both."

This is a very categorical statement of knowledge on the part of the Bevanites about what the Kremlin leaders have already decided, and one doubts whether they have derived it from any other source than wish-fulfillment.

Bevan's article likewise jumps from the mechanical thesis about economics-politics to heights of prophecy. He envisages the "next stage in the evolution of Russian constitutional forms" as coming when the leaders are prepared "to submit themselves to some system of regularized election." First must come the curtailment of the political police and creation of an independent judiciary. At this point we head for futuristic fantasy.

IT'S NOT A PLOT

Bevan continues: "But liberty is a heady wine and once tasted the appetite grows. If it happens that changes in Russian political leadership can no longer be brought about by secret assassination, some other way must be found. Of course this way already partly exists as the recent elections in Moscow have shown." (Italics added.)

This is a transition from fantasy-futures to falsified presents. We are not told anything else about what "the recent elections in Moscow have shown." Bevan seems to be as much in a hurry to hasten the announcement of Russian democratization as was Deutscher, when the latter unfortunate fellow announced in the *Reporter* that "most" of Stalin's concentration camps have been closed and "the regime appears to have freed itself at last" from this abuse. . . .

In sum: The Bevanites have latched onto one side of the Russian bureaucratic-collectivist reality—the contradiction between the economic planning needs of the system and the totalitarian structure—but instead of seeing this as a revolutionary dynamic, they transform it into the motivations of a scheme by the top leaders to reform the system from above.

Looked at this way, there is a familiar tinge to it. . . . Can it be the "conspiracy" theory of Stalinism turned upside-down?

The long title of Bevan's article was: "Don't Write Off These Kremlin Changes as Just Another 'Plot!'" But isn't that exactly what the Bevanite theory makes of it—a "plot" by the tops—even though it is just the opposite of the plot dreamed of by the Stalinophobes?

What we see, in place of this "plot," is the dynamics of social revolution under Stalinism.

Losing in Cold War — —

(Continued from page 1)

Democratic and Republican Parties, and that speeches by them on foreign policy would cast some light on what new departures, if any, this government is planning, and what the Democrats propose to do that is radically different from what is being done.

It must be admitted that anyone seeking light on these matters would have found powerful little of it in the reports of the speeches by these gentlemen.

To start with, President Eisenhower's speech was as empty of any clue to what American policy has been or will be in the future in all the ticklish areas as it could possibly be. Taking as his text the shots at Concord which were "heard 'round the world," and the American revolution, Eisenhower said that:

"These ideas of freedom are still the truly revolutionary political principles abroad in the world. They appeal to the timeless aspirations of mankind. In some regions they flourish; in some they are officially outlawed. But everywhere, to some degree, they stir and inspire humanity."

Heartily agreement with these sentiments still leaves open a host of questions. Among the places where "these ideas of freedom" are "officially outlawed" are the countries and peoples controlled by America's allies such as Franco Spain and the French regime in Algeria, to say nothing of South Korea and Thailand. And when the president added that "We must accept the right of each nation to choose its own path to the future," it is clear that he may have been speaking of some ideal to which humanity might one day aspire, but certainly not about American foreign policy.

SYMPATHY, BUT—

This was made absolutely clear in the speech delivered by the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs. The ASSNESAA informed his audience that the United States is exerting its influence in helping the African people achieve independence by "orderly evolution" rather than "violent revolution."

It would appear that shooting in the interest of freedom may have been all right for New England farmers at Concord, but it is not for the peoples in the territories supervised by this gentleman on behalf of the American government.

Since the *Times* does not do the ASSNESAA the honor of reproducing his speech in full, we must content ourselves with brief extracts from it. But the general drift is unmistakable:

"The United States basically is in sympathy with this desire for independence, Mr. Allen said, but it must also consider its friendship and alliance with the European powers that control the African continent."

"All of the so-called colonial powers in Africa are friends of the United States 'in the world-wide contest between the free and Communist worlds,'" he noted.

"Relationship" established by them with countries in Africa date from an era when the concepts of international relations were different," he added.

"It is more largely a question of transforming this relationship into a co-operative endeavor by which the newly emerging states in Africa may achieve and maintain their national self-respect."

"A strong free and friendly Africa is extremely important to United States security."

REALITIES

The president, it appears, talks for broader domestic and foreign consumption. He can let himself go a little with regard to shots for freedom and the highest aspirations of mankind. But when the ASSNESAA talks to the experts of the Academy for Political and Social Sciences, all these hearty gestures are put aside and we get a cool assessment of realities.

There is actual shooting going on for freedom right now in Algeria. Algerian farmers are sniping at the organized troops of French imperialism in guerrilla warfare. Where does the United States stand in this conflict?

Allen does not even use the word "independence" to describe what the peoples of Africa want. He speaks of "self-respect," of which the French and others are willing to let them have plenty, as long as they stay in their place. He even refers to the "so-called colonial powers," in short . . . anything to avoid giving offense to those members of the "free world" who are holding the peoples of Africa in colonial bondage.

Well, if the Republicans either say nothing, or betray their real policies in unguarded speeches to "scientific" bodies, how about the Democrats?

Stevenson really lashed out in his

speech against the record of the Republicans on foreign policy. His method was to draw a glowing picture of Democratic successes in the field, and to contrast it with a dismal portrayal of Republican failures. With John Foster Dulles on tap as a whipping boy, it would have been hard for him to miss with some of his famous quips.

MAN WITH THE PHRASE

But if what the Democrats did in the past always worked so well, and what the Republicans have done has been so disastrous, what radical changes in policy did Stevenson have to urge on the American people?

Seeking for something dramatic to headline, the papers claimed that Stevenson advocated an end to H-bomb tests, and the giving of all American foreign aid via the United Nations. Actually, as is his way, he spoke of "giving earnest consideration" to such policies. He maintained the air of a man who is leaving the door open for a retreat from everything he "urges," or "suggests" now under the pressures of office.

Actually he spoke of a number of additional matters in the same vague way. He came out for prudence rather than Dulles' bellicosity; for finding a way in which to use America's food surpluses "as raw materials of diplomacy" (something every government since the days of Coolidge has sought); and came out four-square for "a world-wide war against want" and for "liberty, human freedom, independence, the American idea—call it what you please—which is more precious and potent than guns and butter."

That is about as specific as Stevenson got. But even while talking about bold new approaches, the American imperialist attitude which saturates the political atmosphere found its expression.

"Also, on the question of colonialism the Administration has done nothing to evolve a reasoned and sound American position, linked to our own traditions as well as to respect for our friends and a due concern for world stability. In the absence of a national attitude we have floundered around trying to be all things to all people and thereby antagonizing everyone."

WHICH FRIENDS?

There is a forthright champion of the rights of the peoples fighting for freedom, for you! Which of "our friends" is he talking about? The people of Algeria or the French imperialists? The Cypriots or the British? The Okinawans or . . . ? But the question is answered in his text. A "due concern for world stability" means a due concern for the status quo. After all, who is rocking the boat? The hotheads who are trying to win their freedom, and don't wait for the measured cadences of Stevenson's polished speeches.

Although the *Times* only reproduces Kennan's remarks (alluded to above) about as briefly as it did those of the ASSNESAA gentleman, what came through was a truism which points up everything LABOR ACTION has to say about foreign policy.

"We seem to have a feeling that because such things as tariffs and immigration rules, crop subsidies, security procedures and race relations are technically domestic matters we can go ahead and do whatever we want to about them without taking seriously into account the feelings of other people. This is precisely where we make our mistake."

That is to say, foreign policy is basically an extension of domestic policy. All the high moral sentiments in the world, voiced in the most attractive manner, will not bring about a significant change in America's foreign policy as long as it is shaped and directed by political parties which give their allegiance to American and world capitalism rather than to democracy. That is true of both major parties today. It is the mission of the American labor movement to fight for a fundamental change in these policies to the point at which they will conform to the interests of democracy all over the world, and hence to the interests of the vast majority of the American people.

As long as American labor remains tied to the basic premises which unite the foreign policy of both major parties it will be incapable of fighting for a really democratic foreign policy. And as long as American labor insists on conducting its politics inside the framework of these two parties, it will find it virtually impossible to break with these basic premises.

Foreign policy is, as Kennan says, inextricably bound up with domestic policy. It is high time that American labor took a really fresh look at both.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

ISL FUND DRIVE

The Last 30% Is the Hardest

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

A somewhat better showing was made this week as we approach the closing weeks in the fund drive. Over \$800 was received in the past days, lifting the total contributions past the \$7000 mark, and leaving 30 percentage points to be made up before we can pull the curtains on this year's campaign.

There is still a distance to go and it is a most important stretch of the drive. We have just got to make it. That means that every area has to go all out to close the campaign successfully.

This week New York made a real effort and upped its place in the standings considerably. More than \$400 was sent in by New York, raising it to almost three-quarters of its goal. It was a fine spurt, but Chicago managed to send in a good payment and still leads New York by more than 10 percentage points.

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

City	Quota	Paid	%
	\$10,000	\$7018.20	70.1
St. Louis	25	60	240
Oregon	50	50	100
Reading	50	50	100
Natl. Office	1,250	1065	85.2
Chicago	2,000	1620	81
Los Angeles	650	526.45	80.9
Detroit	350	270.75	77.3
Bay Area	400	300	75
Cleveland	150	110	73.3
New York	3,800	2565	67.2
Newark	400	248	62
Streator	25	15	60
Philadelphia	200	105	52.5
Buffalo	150	55	36.6
Pittsburgh	200	58	29
Seattle	150	20	13.3
Indiana	100	0	0
Akron	25	0	0

As a matter of fact, this was one of the better weeks in the campaign. It saw not only the aforementioned making payments, but also Detroit, Cleveland, Newark, Philadelphia and Buffalo come through.

The big stumbling-block, and the reason why we still remain too far from the finish of the campaign, is that only three areas have reached the 100 per cent mark, and these are small-quota areas. None of the cities with more substantial quotas has turned the trick yet, and it is on these that we count above all to finish at the top.

With the day drawing nearer to the resumption of the hearing in the ISL case against the attorney general, the importance of a successful fund drive is raised even higher. It would be a shame if we were handicapped in our long and difficult work to obtain a hearing, and spearhead the fight on the Attorney General's list, because of financial difficulties. We are, in fact, making the fight for everybody in this case.

We have to carry it through to a finish. It is not too late now to help us. We need everyone's assistance. So don't hesitate to send in your contribution to the fund drive and do it now.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City
specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.
Send for our free book list.

Get Acquainted!
Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

1 year at \$2. New

6 months at \$1. Renewal

Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE